

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 263 638

CS 505 113

AUTHOR McDowell, Earl E.
TITLE Faculty Members' Perceptions of Information Adequacy and Communication Relationships in Their "World of Work."
PUB DATE 8 Nov 85
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (71st, Denver, CO, November 7-10, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Communication Research; Department Heads; Higher Education; Information Needs; *Information Sources; Job Satisfaction; *Organizational Communication; School Surveys; Sex Differences; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to explore college faculty members' perceptions of current and desirable information from their department chairs or heads and their relationships with chairs, coworkers, and top administrators. Respondents, 131 faculty members at a midwestern university, completed two instruments--the Receiver Information Scale and the Communication Relationships Scale of the International Communication Association (ICA) Communication Audit. The results indicated that faculty members received limited information about technical changes, mistakes and failures of their departments, teaching evaluations, and job-related problems. Overall, female faculty members indicated that they receive less information from department chairs than did male faculty members, and they rated their relationships with chairs, colleagues, and top administrators lower than did male faculty members. (Tables of data are included.) (HTH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED263638

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"Faculty Members' Perceptions of
Information Adequacy and Communication
Relationships in Their 'World of Work'"

by
Earl E. McDowell
Professor
Department of Rhetoric
University of Minnesota

Speech Communication Association
November 8, 1985

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl E. McDowell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 505 113

**"Faculty Members' Perceptions of
Information Adequacy and Communication
Relationships in Their 'World of Work'"**

Abstract

This study focuses on faculty members' perceptions of present and desired information from their department chairs/heads and relationships with chairs/heads, co-workers, and top administrators, as well as their personal influence in the group organization. The results reveal that faculty members desire more information on departmental policies, how they are being judged, and how department decisions are being made that affect their jobs. Overall, the results indicate that female faculty members receive less information from chairs/heads and rate their relationships with chairs/heads, co-workers and top administrators lower than male faculty members. Specific results are reported and discussed in this paper.

Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak (1978) present a digest of research findings in the discipline of organizational communication. Specifically, their review focuses on three areas: (1) historical overview of the major findings from North America and Europe, (2) major findings for the International Communication Association (ICA) Audit, and (3) implications of all major findings for future research. The following findings are based on a review of the articles that used the ICA audit:

1. Most employees want to receive, more than send, information.
2. Employees desire much job-related information from supervisors and more organizational information from top management.
3. Information from top management is of lower quality than from other key sources, and employees would like more face-to-face information with top management.
4. Employees seem to receive less than adequate information regarding reasons for changes of innovation, the relative performance of their organization or department opportunities for advancement and the financial health of the organization.
5. Employees like working and enjoy healthy interpersonal relationships built upon trust with those closest to them.
6. The greater the distance between communication sources and receivers in organizations, the less information received, the less opportunity to request information, the less the follow-up, the poorer the information quality and the greater the grapevine communication.

7. Immediate supervisors and co-workers are the most trusted, most valued as sources, and most often turned to for information. The supervisor also is the most important link with the organizational hierarchy and acts as a direct mediator of rewards and sanctions for the individual. Likewise, interpersonal relationships with co-workers are important to a pleasant work atmosphere and a feeling of identity within the work group.

Overall, the extensive review of literature identifies and integrates major findings of organizational communication. The findings indicate that employees desire information about their work environment, and enjoy interpersonal relationships with supervisors, co-workers, and top management.

The review also discusses how theories relate to these findings. For example, the employees' desire for information about their jobs supports an operant reinforcement model. That is, employees value information that is instrumental to their success. In addition, employee participation can reduce information uncertainty. Weick (1979) asserts that employee satisfaction is a consequence of equivocality reduction.

More recent research by Spikes and Daniels (1981) also discusses the function of organizational communication, the reduction of uncertainty notion that organizing processes are fundamentally directed toward the reduction of information equivocality within an organizational environment. Specifically, Spikes and Daniels focus on perceived information adequacy. They randomly selected 600 case files from the ICA Communication Audit Data Bank of 18 government, academic, and

private-sector organizations. The Receiver Information Scale was used to measure the amount of information participants perceive that they receive and the amount they desire to receive. Relational satisfaction was measured by having participants rate the 18-item Communication Relationships Scale of the ICA Audit survey questionnaire.* Position in the organization, age and sex were used as independent variables in the study. The results supported the hypothesis that satisfaction with communication relationships is higher for organizational members who perceive that they are adequately informed than for members who perceive that they are inadequately informed.

Previous research by Tompkins (1962) found a positive relationship between knowledge levels and satisfaction with communication, while Perry and Mahoney (1955) found no consistent relationship. Sanborn (1961) also found no relationship between communication satisfaction and morale and a negative relationship between communication satisfaction and upward communication. More recent research in which the Receiver Information Scale and Communication Relationship Scale were used did obtain similar results as reported by Spikes and Daniels. That is, Daly, Falcione, and Damhorst (1979) found a relationship between perceived adequacy of information and relational satisfaction.

*See Appendix A for the Receiver Information Scale and the Communication Relationships Scale. Also see the instrument section for detailed accounts of the instruments.

In both the Spikes and Daniels study and Daly, Falcione, and Damhorst study, no significant differences occurred between and among groups of independent variables in rating the Receiver Information Scale and the Communication Relationship Scale. Finally, these studies support Weick's model of organizing.

The results of the review indicate that there are relationships between and among information adequacy variables and communication relationship variables. There, however, is a need to replicate and extend these findings with specific target groups. Thus, in this study, faculty members are asked to rate their perceptions of information adequacy "current" and "needed" scales and relationship variables: immediate supervisor, personal influence, co-workers and top administrators. Specifically, faculty members will rate their department chairs/heads in terms of present and desired information adequacy, and will rate department chairs/heads, coworkers, and top administrators, as well as their personal influence, in the organization. Demographic variables sex, age, teaching experience and academic rank are used as exploratory, independent variables. Even though previous research indicates these are not good discriminating variables, perhaps they will be in an academic setting.

Research Questions

1. What are the highest and lowest rated Receiver Information: current scales, needed scales, and Communication Relationships: immediate supervisor scales, personal

influence scales, co-worker scales, and top administrator scales?

2. Will there be differences between the means of biological sex groups, among the means of age groups, among the means of teaching experience groups, and among the means of academic rank groups in rating receiver information variables and communication relationship variables?
3. Will there be significant interaction effects between and among levels of independent variables in rating receiver information variables and communication relationship variables?
4. Will there be significant relationships between Receiver Information: current scales, and needed scales, and Communication Relationships: immediate supervisor scales, personal influence scales, co-worker scales and top administrator scales?
5. What relationship variables are the best predictors of Receiver Information "current" scores?
6. Will there be significant differences among the means of high, medium and low receiver information current groups and among the means of high, medium and low receiver information needed groups in rating communication relationship variables? Will there be interaction effects?
7. Will there be significant differences between the means of high and low receiver information current groups and high and low receiver information needed groups in rating communication relationship variables? Will there be interaction effects?

8. Satisfaction with communication relationships is higher for organization members who perceive that they are adequately informed than for members who perceive that they are inadequately informed. (Spiker and Daniels hypothesis)

Procedures

A random sample of 300 faculty members at a midwestern university was selected for the study. All faculty members were sent a cover letter explaining the purposes of the research and copies of the Receiver Information Scale and Communication Relationships Scale of the ICA Communication Audit survey questionnaire (see Appendix A). Faculty members were asked to rate their department chairs/heads on Receiver Information Scale and the department head/chair, co-workers, top administrators and themselves on Communication Relationships Scales of the ICA Communication Audit. Approximately 46 percent (131 faculty members) completed and returned the questionnaires. Table 1 presents a demographic profile of biological sex groups, age groups, teaching experience groups and academic rank groups.

Instruments

As indicated above subjects completed two instruments: Receiver Information Scale and Communication Relationships Scale of the ICA Communication Audit.

a. Receiver Information Scale

The Receiver Information scale consists of 13 pairs (current vs. needed) of Likert-type items focusing on organizational topic areas from the ICA Audit survey questionnaire.

Goldhaber, Porter and Yates (1978) report reliability indices (coefficient alpha) of .88 for the "current" subscales and .85

for the "needed" subscales. They also report that the validity index for the Receiver Information: "current" scale was .69, and the index for the Receiver Information: "needed" of .07 with the Organizational Outcome scale. Richetto (1969) and Yates, Porter and Goldhaber (1976) report that the instrument is unidimensional.

b. Communication Relationships Scale of the ICA Audit

The Communication Relationships Scale of the ICA Communication Audit consists of 18 items. Research by Daly, Falcione and Damhorst (1979) concludes that the scale consists of four factors. That is, the principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation yielded four factors that account for 66.9 percent of the variance. The factors were labeled immediate supervisor, personal influence, co-workers and top management. Reliability estimates for the four factors were .94 (immediate supervisor), .81 (personal influence), .76 (co-workers) and .88 top management. They concluded that the instrument is multidimensional.

Statistical analyses

Initially, descriptive statistics are used to determine percentages and means of each item of the instruments. Next, composite means on the Receiver Information Scale and Communication Relationship Scales are computed. Analyses of variances are used to determine differences for main effects and interaction effects of sex, age, teaching experience and academic rank in rating dependent measures. Specifically, three-way analyses of variances were completed on sex, teaching experience and academic rank, and one-way analyses of variances were completed to

determine differences between age groups on dependent measures. Next, Pearson Correlation coefficients and stepwise multiple correlations were completed to determine the relationships between variables and to determine the best predictors of Receiver Information "current," and "needed" scales. Two-way analyses of variances were completed to determine differences between and among levels of receiver information current groups, between and among levels of receiver information needed groups and to check on interaction effects in rating communication relationship variables. For these analyses participants scoring one standard deviation above the mean on the Receiver Information "current" scale were classified into the high current group, and those scoring one standard deviation below the mean were classified as low communication current groups. Others were classified in the medium group. The same procedure was used to classify participants into high, low and medium Receiver Information "needed" groups. If significant differences occurred among age groups, teaching experience groups, academic rank groups, receiver information current groups, and receiver information need groups in rating dependent measures, post hoc analyses were completed using the Scheffe procedure to determine between which groups significance occurred.

Next, discrepancy scores (D) for each 100 cases were determined by summing the differences between responses to the 13 pairs of items in the Receiver Information scale (D = current-needed) with a potential range for D of -52 and +52. Following the statistical procedures outlined by Spiker and Daniels, 32% (range = -2 to +17) was designed as the "high adequacy" group, while the lower 32% (range = -52 to -20) was designed the "low adequacy" group. Stepwise discriminant analysis was

used to determine differences between high and low groups on the Relationship Scale dimensions.

Results

The mean results, reported in Tables 2 through 6, indicate that faculty members perceive that they receive the greatest amount of information on items pertaining to departmental policies, specific problems faced by administrators, and pay and benefits. Participants receive the least amount of information on how they are performing on the job, on how technical changes are made, and on how job-related problems are handled. The results also indicate that they desire the greatest amount of information on departmental policies, how they are being judged, and how department decisions are being made that affect their jobs. Participants desire limited information on job duties, technical changes, and job-related problems.

The composite results for the Receiver Information Scale, reported in Table 4, indicate that there are limited, insignificant differences between biological sex groups. Other results reveal that younger teachers with limited teaching experience and lower rank receive more information than older teachers with more teaching experience and higher academic rank. Overall, older teachers with more teaching experience and higher academic rank desire more information than other experience groups. However, limited differences exist between and among levels of independent measures in rating "needed" information items.

Results on the Communication Relationship Scale reveal that faculty members are most satisfied with their relationships with immediate supervisors as they rated, "My head listens to me;" "My head is honest with me;" and "I can tell my chair/head when things are going wrong;"

higher than other relationship items. Faculty members are least satisfied with their relationships with top administrators. The items, "I trust top management." "Top administrators are sincere in their efforts to communicate with faculty members." and "My co-workers get along with each other." are the lowest rated items. Females rated their communication relationships with immediate supervisors, co-workers, and top management, as well as their personal influence in the department, lower than male faculty members. The mean differences among age groups indicates "51-60" age group rated relationship variables lower than other groups, but feel that they have more personal influence and rated top administrators higher. Similar mean results occurred for the teaching experience groups. That is, the "16-25" teaching experience group rated immediate supervisors the lowest of the experience groups, but, unlike the age groups, rated their personal influence the lowest. Finally, full professors rated immediate supervisors and top administrators higher than other groups (see Tables 3 and 5).

The results for the communication relationship variables indicate that significant differences occurred between biological sex groups in rating immediate supervisors ($F = 4.125, p.004$), among age groups in rating personal influence ($F = 4.273, p.003$), and among teaching experience groups ($F = 4.167, p.004$). The Scheffe results indicate significant differences occurred between "51-60" and all other age groups and the "16-25" teaching experience group and other groups at the .1 level. No significant differences occurred among academic rank groups in rating communication relationship variables. Likewise, no significant differences occurred for the main effects of sex, age,

teaching experience, and academic rank in rating information adequacy variables.

The correlational analyses, reported in Table 7, revealed there are significant negative relationships between (1) receiver information "current" scores and (2) immediate supervisors scores and personal influence scores. Positive significant relationships exist between all communication relationship variables. The multiple correlational analysis revealed that immediate supervisor scores is the best predictor of information "current" scores (see Table 8).

When using scores on the Receiver Information Scale to categorize subjects into high, medium and low current groups, significant differences occurred in rating all dependent measures. The Scheffe procedure yielded significant differences between high vs. low, and medium vs. low in rating immediate supervisors ($p < .10$). Significant differences also occurred between high vs. low in rating personal influence ($p < .10$). Post hoc analysis using the Scheffe procedure yielded no significant results (see Table 9).

Finally, two-way analyses of variance were performed on just the high vs. low information adequacy current groups. Significant differences occurred between groups in rating all relationship variables. No significant interaction effects occurred. There were no significant differences between need groups in rating relationship variables. The discriminant analysis results between the "high adequacy" and "inadequacy" groups indicate that significant differences occurred ($X = 137, .24; df = 4; p < .001; R .61$). Over 76% of the sample were correctly classified into the two groups. The univariate F results indicate that significant differences occurred between groups in

rating all relationship variables. In all cases the "high adequacy" group rated the relationship variables higher than the "inadequacy" group.

Discussion

An interpretation of the results of the study, in part, support the findings of previous research in organizational settings. That is, faculty members receive limited information about technical changes, mistakes and failures of their departments, teaching evaluations and job-related problems. Thus, there appears to be much information uncertainty or equivocality within organizational environment. For example, 70 percent of faculty members desire a great deal of information on department decisions that affect their positions, while only 28 percent receive a great deal of information. Likewise, 64 percent desire much information on "how they are being judged," while 42 percent receive a great deal of information. Overall, faculty members perceive that they receive a great deal of information 33 percent of the time, while they desire to receive much information 54 percent of the time.

These findings support the notion of information uncertainty, or as Goldhaber indicates, information inadequacy. These findings support the desire for more information on job-related matters, support the operant reinforcement model, or as indicated earlier, employees value information which is instrumental to successful performance and, consequently, organizational reward.

The results focusing on the Communication Relationships Scale indicate that faculty members rated their relationships with chair/heads highest and their relationships with top administrators lowest. That

is, 64 percent of faculty members perceive that they have positive is 72 percent of the male respondents and 46 percent of female respondents rated their relationship with chairs/heads positively. Approximately 50 percent of respondents reported that they have positive relationships with co-workers, while 31 percent report positive relationships with top administrators. Spikes and Daniels explain that relationships with co-workers may provide only a limited basis for enactment of behavior cycles which might be directed at reducing equivocality in the topic areas addressed by the Receiver Information Scale (items generally pertaining to the job, pay, benefits and organizational policies). These findings seem to indicate an unhealthy communication climate. Future research, if these results are typical for faculty members, might focus on peer relationships as 50 percent perceive they do not have positive relationships with co-workers.

The correlational analyses indicate significant relationships with perceived information adequacy and communication relationships with chair/heads and, to a limited degree, with personal influence in the organization but not with co-workers and top administrators. The best predictor of perceived information adequacy was communication relationships with chair/head, which accounted for 27 percent of the variance. These results do not, for the most part, support those of Daly, Falcione and Damhorst. In addition, these results are counter to those reported by Goldhaber, Yates, Porter and Lesniak (1978). Again, if these are accurate perceptions, an interview study might be completed to uncover reasons for lack of trust between faculty members.

As reported in the result section, limited significant differences occurred between and among levels of independent variables in rating

communication relationship variables, and no significant differences occurred in rating receiver information variables. Unlike previous research female faculty members rated their relationships with chair/head significantly lower than male faculty members and marginally lower on other relationship variables. These results indicate that male faculty members develop closer, more trusting, interpersonal relationship with department chair/heads than female faculty members. Males also feel they have more personal influence and develop closer interpersonal relationship with coworkers and top administrators. Goldhaber, Yates, Porter, and Lesniak (1978) point out that perceptions of relationships and communication are a part of an overall evaluation of the communication climate of the organization. Thus, perceptions of climate are related to feelings of involvement and ability to influence an organization. Weick (1979) suggests that "satisfaction is determined by the extent to which an actor can remove equivocality from his environment." Thus, those reporting adequacy of information are resolving equivocality, while those experiencing inadequacy of information are not experiencing active reduction.

Unlike previous research, younger employees perceive that they receive more information than older employees. Similar results occurred for teaching experience and academic rank groups. That is, faculty members with the least amount of experience and the lowest rank perceive that they receive more information than faculty members with more experience and higher rank. Older faculty members with more teaching experience and higher academic rank desire more information than younger teachers with limited teaching experience and lower academic rank.

The significant differences between high and low information adequacy current groups in rating all communication relationship variables reinforce the idea of the importance of information adequacy in building communication relationships with chairs/heads, co-workers, and top administrators. Furthermore, a faculty member's perceptions of his/her personal influence is determined by information adequacy and relationships with members of the organization.

Future research should focus on educational groups. For example, research might compare perceptions of information adequacy and communication relationships within and between colleges at major universities. Specifically, comparisons might be made between public and private universities. The size of universities also might be used as an independent variable. Similar studies might be completed at the high school and elementary levels. For example, in this study females were less satisfied with their relationships with immediate supervisors than males, but would this be true at the elementary and secondary levels? Through a series of studies researchers can learn more about information adequacy and communication relationships between teachers and administrations, between coworkers and the communication climate in the educator's "world of work."

References

1. Daly, J. Falcione, R., Damhorst, M., "Communication correlates of Relational and Organizational Satisfaction: An Audit Based Investigation," International Communication Association convention, Philadelphia, 1979.
2. Goldhaber, G., Yates, P., Porter, D., and Lesniak, R., "Organizational Communication: 1978," Human Communication Research, 1978, 5, 79-96.
3. Goldhaber, G. Organization Communication, 2nd ed., Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown, 1979.
4. Goldhaber, G., Porter, D., and Yates, M., "The ICA Communication Audit Survey Instrument: 1977 Organizational Norms." International Communication Association Convention, 1977.
5. Perry, D., and Mohoney, T., "Inplant Communication and Employee Morale," Personnel Psychology, 1955, 8, 339-346.
6. Richetto, D. "Source Credibility and Personal Influence in Three Contexts: A Study of Dyadic Communication in a Complex Aerospace Organization," Dissertation, Purdue University, 1969.
7. Sanborn, G. "An Analytical Study of Oral Communication Practices in a Nationwide Retail and Sales Organization," Dissertation, Purdue University, 1961.
8. Spikes, B., and Daniels, T., "Information Adequacy and Communication Relationships: An Empirical Examination of 18 Organizations," The Western Journal of Speech Communication, 1981, 45, 342-354.

9. Tompkins, P. "An Analysis of Communication Between Headquarters and Selected Units of the National Labor Union," Dissertation, Purdue University, 1962.
10. Weick, K. The Social Psychology of Organizing, Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979.
11. Yates, M., Porter, D., Goldhaber, G., "The ICA Communication Audit System: Results of Six Studies," International Communication Association convention, Portland, Oregon, 1976.

Communication Inventory

Please rate the following items from 1 to 5. 1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3=uncertain, 4-disagree, 5-strongly disagree.

1. My relationship with the chair/head of my department is satisfying. _____
2. I trust my chair/head. _____
3. My chair/head listens to me. _____
4. My chair/head is honest with me. _____
5. My chair/head is friendly with his/her faculty members. _____
6. I can tell my chair/head when things are going wrong. _____
7. My chair/head praises me for a good job. _____
8. I have a say in decisions that affect my job. _____
9. I influence operations in my department. _____
10. I have a part in accomplishing my organization's goals. _____
11. I trust my co-workers. _____
12. My co-workers get along with each other. _____
13. My relationship with my co-workers is satisfying. _____
14. I trust top management. _____
15. Top administrators are sincere in their efforts to communicate with faculty members. _____

Please provide the following demographic information:

Sex (Check (x) one)

College

male _____

female _____

Academic Rank

Age _____

Number of years of teaching experience _____

Receiving Information Scale

Please rate the chairperson/head of your department (from 1 to 5) on the following items: 1=very little, 2=little, 3=some, 4=great, 5=very great. Place the number in the space to the right of each item.

	This is the amount of information I receive now.	This is the amount of information I need to receive.
1. How well I am doing in my position.	_____	_____
2. My job duties.	_____	_____
3. Department policies.	_____	_____
4. Pay and benefits.	_____	_____
5. How technical changes affect my position.	_____	_____
6. Mistakes and failures of my department.	_____	_____
7. How am I being judged.	_____	_____
8. How my job related problems are being handled.	_____	_____
9. How department decisions are made that affect my position.	_____	_____
10. Promotion and advancement opportunities in my department.	_____	_____
11. Important new program developments in my organization.	_____	_____
12. How my job relates to the total department.	_____	_____
13. Specific problems faced by administration.	_____	_____

TABLE 1
Demographic Profiles

Demographics	Levels	No.	%
Sex	Male	101	77
	Female	26	20
	Not Identified	4	3
Age	"25 - 35"	17	13
	"36 - 42"	40	31
	"43 - 50"	23	18
	"51 - 60"	36	27
	"61 or older"	6	5
	Not Identified	9	7
Teaching Experience	"1 - 5"	17	13
	"6 - 10"	21	16
	"11 - 15"	26	20
	"16 - 25"	29	22
	"26 or more"	34	26
	Not Identified	4	3
Academic Rank	Assistant Prof.	27	21
	Associate Prof.	41	31
	Full Prof.	54	42
	Instructor	4	3
	Not Identified	4	3

TABLE 2

Faculty Members Current Needed Communication with Chairpersons/Heads
on the Receiver Information Scale

Items	Means	Little %	Great %	Means	Little %	Great %
1. How well I am doing in my position.	2.7	34	27	3.3	5	51
2. My job duties.	2.8	34	31	3.0	18	40
3. Department policies.	3.1	28	42	3.5	5	60
4. Pay and benefits.	2.9	32	39	3.4	11	56
5. How technical changes affect my position.	2.3	47	19	2.8	15	46
6. Mistakes and failures of my department.	2.6	46	31	3.4	8	55
7. How am I being judged.	2.7	42	31	3.6	5	64
8. How my job related problems are being handled.	2.4	34	24	3.	8	46
9. How department decisions are made that affect my position.	2.8	28	34	3.7	4	70
10. Promotion and advancement opportunities in my department.	2.8	34	40	3.3	8	62
11. Important new program developments in my organization.	2.4	30	40	3.3	6	56
12. How my job relates to the department.	2.8	37	33	3.3	8	50
13. Specific problems faced by administration.	3.1	29	44	3.3	7	47

TABLE 3

Faculty Members' Perceptions of Their Department Chairs/Heads/Co-worker
and Top Administrators on the Communication Inventory

Items	Means	Agree %	Disagree %
1. My relationship with the chair/head of my department is satisfying.	2.3	64	28
2. I trust my chair/head.	2.3	62	26
3. My chair/head listens to me.	2.2	71	17
4. My chair/head is honest with me.	2.1	70	16
5. My chair/head is friendly with his/her faculty members.	2.2	73	15
6. I can tell my chair/head when things are going wrong.	2.0	72	12
7. My chair/head praises me for a good job.	2.5	60	28
8. I have a say in decisions that affect my job.	2.4	59	21
9. I influence operations in my department.	2.4	59	17
10. I have a part in accomplishing my organization's goals.	2.1	74	12
11. I trust my co-workers.	2.3	61	19
12. My co-workers get along with each other.	2.8	46	31
13. My relationship with my co-workers is satisfying.	2.4	62	22
14. I trust top management.	3.1	29	44
15. Top administrators are sincere in their efforts to communicate with faculty members.	3.0	33	41

TABLE 4

Means on Receiver Information Scale: Current and Needed

Demographics	Levels	Current	Needed
Sex	Male	19.7	35.
	Female	19.1	34.
Age	"25-35"	22.6	31.8
	"36-42"	19.3	33.4
	"43-50"	21.4	34.1
	"51-60"	19.6	32.4
Teaching Experience	"1-5"	22.1	31.5
	"6-10"	19.1	33.
	"11-15"	21.8	35.5
	"16-25"	17.1	37
	"26 +"	19.	32.6
Academic Rank	Assistant Prof	20.1	32.4
	Associate Prof	19.6	34.7
	Full	19.6	34
	Instructor	16.	30.5

TABLE 5

Means on Communication Inventory Factors
for Sex and Age Groups

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables							
	M	Sex	F	"25-35"	"36-42"	"43-50"	"51-60"	"61+"
Immediate Supervisor	15.05	19.24	15.4	15.6	15.3	19.72	14.1	
Personal Influence	6.9	7.7	7.2	7.4	7.3	6.16	6.7	
Co-workers	7.76	7.84	8.4	8.7	7.8	7.9	7.4	
Top Management	6.2	6.5	7.2	7.1	6.	5.4	5.9	

TABLE 6
Means on Communication Inventory Factors for Teaching Experience and Academic Rank Groups

Dependent Variables	Independent Variables					Academic Rank			
	"1-5"	Teaching Experience			"26+"	Assist.	Assoc.	Full	Instr.
		"6-10"	"11-15"	"16-25"					
Immediate Supervisor	15.8	15.6	15.6	19.3	13.4	17.2	16.	15.3	14.3
Personal Influence	7.7	7.4	5.8	9.1	6.2	7.7	7.8	7.1	5.5
Co-workers	7.8	8.4	7.5	7.7	7.3	7.4	8.2	7.7	6.8
Top Management	7.1	7.3	6.	6.1	5.7	7.2	7.	5.7	6.5

TABLE 7
Correlation Coefficients for Receiver Information and Relationship Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6
RECEIVER INFORMATION						
1. Current	-	.19	-.52**	-.30*	-.12	-.17
2. Needed	-	-	.03	.10	-.12	-.09
3. Immediate Supervisor	-	-	-	.70**	.49**	.53**
4. Personal Influence	-	-	-	-	.79**	.84**
5. Co-workers	-	-	-	-	-	.83**
6. Top Management	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Significant at the .01 level

**Significant at the .001 level

TABLE 8
Multiple Correlations for Receiver Information "Current" Scores

Predictor	Step	R	R ₂
Immediate Supervisor	1	.52	.27
Personal Influence	2	.56	.31
Co-workers	3	.59	.35

TABLE 9

Two-way Analysis of Variance for Communication Relationship:
Summary of Significant Results Variables Among High Medium
and Low Receiver Information

Independent Variables N=131	Dependent Variables	Degree of Freedom	F	P
Current	Immediate Supervisor	2	16.19	.001
Current	Personal Influence	2	4.89	.009
Current	Co-workers	2	3.01	.05
Current	Top Management	2	3.17	.04

TABLE 10

Two-way ANOVA for Communication Relationship Variables: Summary of
Significant Results for Extreme Groups

Independent Variable N=15	Dependent Variable	Degree of Freedom	F	P
High/Low Current	Immediate Supervisor	1	46.36	.001
High/Low Current	Personal Influence	1	37.60	.001
High/Low Current	Co-workers	1	4.29	.04
High/Low Current	Top Management	1	11.75	.001